

MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF JULY 1, 1982

The July Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by Chairman Robert B. Patterson at 3:11 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes.

The Secretary informed the Senate that the printing process had unintentionally omitted a table that was made reference to in the annual report of the Admissions Committee on page A-15. This information was distributed by hand to the Senators. The Secretary also explained that in some copies of the minutes Printing had included two copies of page A-17. The Secretary also made a correction on page A-26 in the report of the Health Professions Advisory Committee where reference was made to formation of that committee by "Dr. William Weston" which should have read "Dr. William Wesson", the former Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The Senate then approved the minutes.

II. Reports of Officers.

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PROVOST FRANCIS T. BORKOWSKI provided the Senate extensive information regarding recent actions by the Governor and the status of the budget, as follows:

Report of
the
Provost
on
the
Budget

Let me first of all say that my comments will be couched in the language of speculation since we do not yet have in writing from the Budget and Control Board or from the state agencies precisely the guidelines by which we must operate. So my comments to you are based in great part on what most of you know that appeared in the press and on all discussions that have taken place between members of the Administration and various state agency personnel.

Policy on
Raises

This past week the Budget and Control Board met and in essence took the following action: they cut all of the budgets of all state agencies by three-tenths of one percent. This was to come up with the six million dollars that the Governor felt was necessary in order to balance the state budget. There were other restrictions among them being that unclassified personnel promotions could be done as long as they would not exceed four percent of the base pay of the preceeding year. So there is a four percent limit on promotions for unclassified personnel. For classified personnel the limit is two percent or zero. There is a great deal of flexibility there - zero or two percent at the time that the classified review takes place. There are mixed signals on the freeze as to whether the freeze remains imposed or not. At this moment anyway it is our judgement that the freeze will not remain. Salary increases are zero percent or two percent to be implemented January of 1983, not one percent now and one percent later or not zero to four - no flexibility in terms of the allocation - it is either zero or two percent. Now we have a lot of things that we need to work through as we get the guidelines.

I will be meeting with the Faculty Welfare Committee next week. I will probably ask for a meeting of the Senate Steering Committee before very long as we obtain the guidelines and at least try to think through what strategy we should take dealing with these restrictions. The possibility of altering them is frankly miniscule. The Budget and Control Board has acted. It is unlikely that any changes would be able to be made. When the final written guidelines come out, of course, there may be some language that may provide flexibility. I simply don't know that since we do not have anything in writing at this time.

I am deeply concerned, as we all are, as you are, concerning this action by the Budget and Control Board and the Governor. It's very distressing when indeed we were playing catch up ball and finally getting to that point in terms of salary increase to have this kind of action taken. We have aggressively made the case and we will continue to make the case about not only the educational value of having the citizenry literate but of a high quality faculty adequately compensated and rewarded with incentives to do a top flight job. Indeed, in some very critical areas where manpower is needed in this state, these actions will have an adverse effect on the ability of the State to attract new technologies and industries. We have constantly made that case in many many quarters. But the Governor and the Budget and Control Board apparently are of the view that the budget must be in balance and they have taken these steps to insure that it is. To what the press has to report on the various controversies among the members of the Budget and Control Board I can add nothing. There are disagreements as to whether this is an overreaction or whether it is necessary. As to what the outcome will be you are as knowledgeable about that as I. It certainly is disappointing, distressing, to have that kind of action taken.

I am of the view regarding the promotion increase that somehow within the institution either this year or next year we will have to find some way to balance out the punitive action that would fall on a number of our colleagues who by poor chance happen to be promoted this year. I think that would be grossly unfair to not be able to provide them with the appropriate type of compensation that traditionally falls to those who are promoted within the academic ranks. I feel strongly that in some way we would have to arrange that so during their tenure here at the University it would not be an ongoing financial detriment to them.

Salary
Enhancement
Issue

I would be happy to respond to questions about the Engineering issue. There have been some comments that the salary enhancement money in the 1981-82 year was to have been precisely directed toward the College of Engineering. Now this is an extraordinarily complex issue dealing with vetoes, the Governor's vetoes, money that was provided the University that was withdrawn from Clemson, and I can say unequivocally that having looked over the appropriation bill and having in front of me the language of the Governor's vetoes that the salary enhancement money was precisely for faculty salaries. It was not to be directed to any one unit in the institution. I certainly grant that we made a very strong case in terms of the College of Engineering and a few of the other colleges where the market is extremely tight that there is concern about losing top flight people to businesses and industries and to other institutions. We certainly made a strong case when the appropriations took place and when the Governor's vetoes took place. There was no directive that any one unit within the institution receive the total amount of salary enhancement funds. You will recall, those of you who were in the Senate last year, that I stated from this podium that we are moving toward in the salary allocations what I called a "market differential" and there would be some units that would have a higher raise than others because of what I consider to be market differential in order to compensate them and to try to keep them here and not to decimate certain units within the institution. I laid that out in front of you and we indeed did do that. But to the charge that another institution in this state, which shall go nameless, directed all their funds to one college and the University of South Carolina was to do the same is simply factually an error. I might also add that thought might have been a priority by the other institution but there was no direct mandate in any of the legislation or the

or the vetoes or directives from the Governor indicating that that institution was to have done that. How they did it was their own concern, I will state that to you unequivocally. Are there any questions at this point in dealing with that matter? Vice President Denton is here to respond to any questions you might have about any of the details in the matter.

PROFESSOR WARD BRIGGS, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, inquired of the Provost "can you tell us then why Clemson did get that money this year and we didn't?"

PROVOST BORKOWSKI answered:

Further
Information
on
Salary
Enhancement
Issue

I can lay it out for you numbers by numbers if you want to take notes. In the Senate bill for 1981-82 there was salary enhancement money added to both USC and Clemson in the amount of \$950,000. After this addition, (you will recall that there were cuts by the Budget and Control Board, there were various recommendations from the House and the Senate) USC had a 1.2 million dollar decrease compared to Clemson's \$452,000 increase. Keep in mind we are dealing with 1981-82 - that's over the prior year. Now some of that is due to the formula, some of that is because we consciously decided to put a cap on enrollment; all of those are factors that enter into the picture. The Governor then vetoed various provisions of all the state agencies. The vetoes for Columbia were \$804,000, where Clemson only received a \$361,000 decrease. There were all kinds of discussions at that time about the various provisions within the Clemson budget. The bottom line in their reduction is \$361,000 and ours was \$804,000. The net budget changes for USC-Columbia became a 2.16 million reduction. Clemson started the year with an increase of \$91,000 in state appropriations for 1981-82. Now the 1981-82 salary plan allowed flexibility for some areas in an excess of the average for the entire University System and we had to go to the Budget and Control Board for request for approval, and this included many changes in the Medical School salaries also. Although we didn't have the funds (which were vetoed) and the budget was decreased, we pushed and pulled from other sources within the University to come up with the salary increment - our top priority was salary enhancement. In essence the bottom line is that we were cut for our salary enhancement and Clemson was not. Allegedly Clemson was cut in other areas and we were allegedly not cut in similar areas. The point is that our salary enhancement fund was cut and theirs was not. We pulled from other sources to provide the salary increases and now when we come to this year we find ourselves looking at a continuation of the salary enhancement money in Clemson's budget but since ours was cut we do not have a continuation of any salary enhancement money since this money was cut out, if that makes sense to you. Clemson falls under the same guidelines regarding salaries this next year as we do. They are not able to provide salary increases in excess of 2% effective in January. So they will have the same salary increases, the same guidelines that the University of South Carolina would. The difference and the point of controversy is that that salary enhancement money left in their budget in 1981-82 transfers into 1983 so it is a part of the total general fund. We do not have that in our general fund. We have less money than they do but the salaries come January remain the same. Does that answer your question?

when we had
105 changes

* See a Hatched
Corrections.

~~PROFESSOR BRIGGS~~ responded in the affirmative. PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, inquired about the 2% merit increase in January and asked the Provost "are you inclined to feel that perhaps this year that everybody is satisfactory or above and will give it across the board or are you inclined to go from 0 to 4 on the same kind of formula that was the 7 or 8%?" The PROVOST responded as follows:

Keep in mind you cannot go from 0 to 4, Ray. There is no flexibility - it's either 0% or it's 2% and there is no flexibility. Some of you may disagree and I trust that more of you will agree. I am committed to the merit principle, strongly committed to the merit principle. However, if it is a matter of 2% or 0% and if we don't give 2%, the state picks up from the faculty members that amount of money because they are given 0%, you can bet everybody is going to get 2%. I mean we are not going to lose any money in the state budget for salaries and argue that point. We would want those funds in our budget.

Underfunding
of 2%
Merit
Raise

PROFESSOR ROBERT ROOD, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, shared with the Senate his understanding that this particular salary package had been underfunded by the Legislature and inquired of the Provost with respect to the 2% merit "will they be moving to provide 2% for everyone or will that be underfunded?" PROVOST BORKOWSKI asked the SYSTEM VICE PRESIDENT FOR FISCAL AFFAIRS to respond to that question and DR. DENTON answered "it is only half funded for the year and that half was only 80% funded". PROFESSOR ROOD asked Vice President Denton if it would not therefore be more appropriate to talk about a 1% merit increase and Dr. Denton responded "in terms of this year's pay average it will be 1%; in terms of the money that they gave to do it with, it will be 8/10 of 1%. PROVOST BORKOWSKI emphasized Dr. Denton's conclusion that "we are not fully funded even at that 1% level".

PROFESSOR CARMELA INGEBRETSON, MEDICINE, raised questions about reduction of \$250,000 for funding of the Medical School and asked the Provost whether or not he saw "the possibility of any layoffs and how would those be handled?" PROVOST BORKOWSKI responded as follows:

Reduction in
Medical
School's
Budget

I simply do not feel comfortable in discussing any action dealing with layoffs at this time because truly without the guidelines and without having any definitive types of information in writing there is little point in speculating and causing any concern along that line. Needless to say, we would want to be very cautious and forestall in any of these areas lay-offs due to financial exigencies. The rationale for the \$250,000 cut is (I can only say) spurious and was provided because there had to be some reason to have another cut. In other words, in order to get the budget in balance a number of cuts took place. When one looks at the rationale for those cuts you are hard pressed to see any justification for them. The Medical University in Charleston was cut \$250,000. The University of South Carolina was cut \$250,000 and the reason provided was that this was because the two institutions were not getting along well together and were not cooperating. That appears in print that that was the reason for the two cuts. I don't mind sharing with you that I had a very direct and frank discussion with Governor Riley about that and stated I find it difficult to accept that as a rationale for a budget cut of a half million dollars. We can argue that point providing the rationale because of non-cooperativeness is simply inaccurate. If you have followed the current discussion between MUSC and USC in the press dealing with USC discussions with the Charleston consortium, you will find that indeed there is substantial cooperation going on and we have a number of different programs going on and joint efforts going on. So clearly that rationale just simply is not adequate. One can only think that the reason for it is something had to be said in order to take another half million dollars out of the state budget.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, inquired of the Provost as to whether or not he would feel free to say something about the status of the agreement on the consortium and the acceptance of that agreement with Richland Memorial Hospital and also asked "has there in fact been three resignations from the Medical School . . . or is this a rumor?" PROVOST BORKOWSKI responded as follows:

Status of
Agreement
with
Richland
Memorial

Ray, I don't really know how many resignations have taken place in the Radiology Department. I can say that the issue of Radiology with the University of South Carolina Medical School and its discussion with Richland Memorial



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
AND LITERATURES
Tel. No. (803) 777-4881

August 9, 1982

Professor John Gardner
College of Applied Professional Sciences
CAMPUS

Dear John:

Many thanks for arranging for me to listen to the tape of the July 1 Senate meeting. I am bound to say that I found two points on which I think the minutes could stand improvement:

1) in F.B.'s statement on p. M-3, in the sentence beginning "Now the 1981-82 salary plan..." (about half-way through the paragraph), I make him out to say, "...for the entire University System when we had to go to the Budget and Control Board for requests for approval, when we had 105 changes, and this included many changes in the Medical School salaries also."

2) The last sentence of his statement, "Does that answer your question?" does not exist. As I hear the tape, it went like this:

F.B: "...come January remain the same. Ok, Ray?" (he calls on Professor Moore; before Moore can speak, F.B. turns to Vice President Pete Denton) "Pete, does that have it pretty well?"

Denton: "Yes, sir."

F.B: "Ray" (calling again on Professor Moore)

You will see that I was not asked if my question was answered and that I had no chance to reply either in the affirmative or the negative.

I'm not certain about the first matter, but I shall probably want to correct the minutes on the second point at our next meeting.

Again, many thanks and in spite of these cavils, take my best congratulations for the fine and thorough job you have done as Secretary this year.

Sincerely yours,

Ward W. Briggs, Jr.
Associate Professor of Classics

Hospital are just absolutely at the pivotal point of holding up and forestalling the affiliation agreement. We have been in discussion with Richland Memorial Hospital on a reaffiliation agreement for roughly 13-14 months. It has been long; it has been tedious and testy. All of you know that the University of South Carolina Medical School was established predicated on the view that there would not be a teaching hospital. Consequently, the Medical School must rely on other medical facilities for clinical practice and for its residency program. We therefore are finding ourselves, you can well imagine, in kind of a defensive position. Because of the way the Medical School was established we need other facilities and Richland Memorial Hospital has been a paramount facility for our teaching-training programs. As the newspaper reported accurately the University of South Carolina will not have a radiology program at Richland Memorial Hospital. The other parts of the affiliation agreement I believe have been satisfactorily resolved and there are certainly some issues which I would have preferred to have been different and there are certainly a number of them at Richland Memorial Hospital who would have been pleased to have it a different way but I think we have a very workable document. One of the striking features is that it will call for quarterly meetings among senior executives of the Hospital and the University to iron out issues that may arise. For many of the issues that arose over the past ten years one cannot fault those who wrote the initial affiliation agreement. It is just impossible to foresee over a period of years what will emerge and what will evolve. We now have mechanisms I believe in the new affiliation agreement to handle problems as they arise and I think we have a good working document. In terms of the University's Medical School joining the Charleston consortium, discussions are going along productively. Our hope is with that and with the Richland Memorial Hospital affiliation we will have broadened out our opportunities to have training programs and clinical residency programs and enough facilities throughout the state so that we can continue to evolve into a very fine Medical School. I am sure we all want that. These have been difficult negotiations because frankly they deal with an awful lot of money and that simply has been a great hangup in terms of private practice and medical education programs. But I think there has been adequate resolution of those issues, certainly with Richland Hospital. Yesterday our Board of Trustees approved the document and it will be signed tomorrow and it goes for five years with the option of running another five years.

PROFESSOR EUGENE LONG, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, inquired of the Provost as to the effects of the recent budget actions on departmental operating budgets and library budget i.e. was a further reduction anticipated or continuation of the present budget? PROFESSOR LONG also asked whether or not further budget reductions should be anticipated? DR. BORKOWSKI answered as follows:

Additional
Budget
Problems -
e.g. Summer
School Deficit

I have no feeling in terms of a future cut. When I talked with the Governor he alluded to the possibility of one - another cut on what we presently have. I am hard pressed to believe that that would be a successful effort. In terms of your own budgets, at the moment until we have these guidelines and until we can ascertain precisely where we stand financially, we will continue to operate on the budgets that you presently are operating under effective July 1 of this year.

Now I have to tell you we have some problems that we did not anticipate when the budgets were finally determined for the academic and academic support areas. One problem that came up is the summer school enrollment which for this

campus is down 11% and that amounts, should that same decrease hold in the second summer session, to a negative \$460,000. The budgets effective this past July were predicated on that money being there. I might add you will recall when we raised the graduate tuition there was concern at that time that the graduate enrollment would decrease because of the tuition increase of 20% this summer. You might be interested in knowing that the graduate enrollment has held up. It's pretty well stabilized this year from last year and the decrease in the enrollment is principally in the area of undergraduate courses. Now I must share with all of you, and we will be coming back to this body through appropriate faculty committees, we have got to come to grips with this summer business. It is costly. It is draining away from the effective functioning during the traditional academic year and some way and some how we are going to have to come up with a mechanism which will meet our legal obligations to the faculty pre-1974 and yet still not be a loss as it is. Because that loss is the loss that you are going to feel as we move into this year, that looms heavy as we look at this coming academic year and I don't quite yet know how we are going to deal with that.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke with reference to this decreased summer school undergraduate enrollment and asked "has there been any effort to try and ascertain what the causes of that are in terms of the hours of scheduled classes, afternoon employment, general economic situation . . . ?" DR. BORKOWSKI answered:

Provost to
Report in
Fall on
Problem of
Lowered
SS Enrollment

The Admissions Office is doing much of that now and we will have a report on that. I will be happy to report to this group come fall as to what the basis has been for a number of people not enrolling in classes. I have to tell you too that I am frankly distressed with the percentage of under enrolled courses. I know that there are some types of individual efforts which faculty do that may not be counted in terms of credit hours taught for which compensation is appropriate but we have a sizeable percentage of under enrolled courses and that is costly. Again, the ones who obviously come out on the short end are all of you as those courses are offered. You are the ones to get hit the hardest in terms of your operating budget through the following year. So we are going to have to put on our creative thinking caps as we try to come up with some different kinds of models to deal with the summer's problems. I do not believe that we can continue at a loss. It simply is having a deleterious effect on our operating budgets.

PROFESSOR ELMER SCHWARTZ, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, returned to the "salary enhancement matter" and asked "in the future are our relations with the Governor's Office likely to improve so that concept can be reinitiated or will Clemson continue their salary enhancement money and we will not?" DR. BORKOWSKI answered Professor Schwartz as follows:

Question on
Future of
Salary
Enhancement
Money

My colleague, Vice President Denton, feels that the salary enhancement money will be again in our budget next year for the 1983-84 year. Your question assumes, when you say "will our relationship improve with the Governor's Office?" that the relationship is not a good one. I don't know what led you to believe that. We have had some issues here with which we differed with the Governor's Office and we will make and continue to make every effort to have a cooperative, congenial relationship. It is mutually beneficial to the Governor's Office and the State of South Carolina and the University were that to take place. I must say to you I thought that from our standpoint we were acting in good faith through the past few months in not increasing tuition and not lobbying for an appropriation over and above what the Budget and Control Board recommended and it is thus with great disappointment that we find these present actions taking place. Whether they were done because of deep real financial difficulties in which the state finds itself, whether they were done for other kinds of

motives, I simply don't feel it would be appropriate to address. Certainly we will make every effort to enhance the cooperative relationships so that the funding can be forthcoming in the succeeding years.

PROFESSOR CARMELA INGEBRETSON, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, made reference to the completion of the Affirmative Action Plan data on "under utilization of women and minorities on this campus" and asked the Provost how he perceived the impact of budgetary limitations effecting the goals of the Affirmative Action Plan. DR. BORKOWSKI'S answer was, in a word, "severely". He elaborated as follows:

Impact of
Budget on
Affirmative
Action Plan

This is of course one of the negative outcomes that has come about from the freeze and from a diminishment of the budget. If we can't hire people into the positions and fill the vacancies clearly that simply puts a lid on the affirmative action plan. We have a 2% increase in January with no funds to be able to move toward enhancing certain areas to improve our affirmative action posture. It will have a negative effect. I might add that that point has been made and been stated to the Governor and the Budget and Control Board members. I believe their priority or prime concern now is the overall posture of the state budget. That will have a negative impact. It has to.

Concluding
Remarks -
Some Positive
Aspects of
Our Present
Situation -
Example:
Private
Fund Drive

Now let me say in concluding that despite this rather difficult position financially that we find ourselves there are some things upon which I think we can feel pretty good about. First of all, in terms of salaries, we are not going backwards. I grant that in terms of hard dollars we are not going forward much but we are not going backwards. I might point out to you that the state of Utah has moved to a 4 day work week and effectively cut out of state agencies 20% of everyone's salary. There are a number of other states that have effectively taken a step backwards. We haven't done that. Secondly, we are very pleased with the efforts of our current fund drive. The formal public announcement is being delayed. As you all know, there has to be a sizeable amount of funds behind you before you move forward and announce it. I am very pleased with the generation of funds and with the expressions of support that we are getting from many quarters of not only the state but from all over the country. In a discussion with President Holderman yesterday he was excited about the response he was receiving concerning the University of South Carolina and the way the University is perceived in many countries abroad and indicated a great deal of optimism that there would be funds moving into our drive from international corporations and possibly from some European governments. That's exciting. Those of you who have had the opportunity of looking at the case for the fund drive know that in the priority list the funds go principally to the academic area or to academic support areas. We are talking about chairs. We are talking about equipment. We are talking about enhancements of areas. So in that regard I am very excited and pleased because indeed if the financial situation remains fairly tight in the United States over a period of time, looking at what this state will provide us, if we indeed can build our endowment and spend a portion of that endowment, a portion of it to give us that margin of excellence, then we can continue the excellent forward momentum that we had and I think we can continue to do that.

Rest assured that as we look at the next few weeks I will be meeting with appropriate faculty governing bodies. Our prime concern is that you feel adequately compensated, stimulated to do the top quality job that you all do. I would hope that there would not be any over reaction within your departments by faculty who become overly concerned and resign projecting that indeed this situation is going to be maintained over an extended period of time. I think that would indeed be regrettable.

So much effort has gone into recruiting top flight people. Are we now to find ourselves losing these people, your colleagues? That would be a major set back for us. I would suggest that it is incumbent upon all of you to keep upbeat about it in discussions with your colleagues. In terms of this regrettable period of the institution, we will move through it and if we simply don't act hastily we can move through it and come out of it a strong institution because I think there is every reason to believe that you can do that. This is going to be a difficult time and we will keep you adequately informed all the way through it.

III. Report of Committees.

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee:

Nominations
for
Patent
and
Copyright
Committee

The CHAIR reminded the Senators of an announcement he had made at the March Senate meeting with respect to nominations to the Patent and Copyright Committee. Two of the six elected faculty members are supposed to rotate off each year and in examining the list of those six members it had been determined that four were to rotate off in 1984, two in 1983 and none in 1982. Hence nominations could not be made until this apparent procedural error had been rectified. The CHAIR explained that with the cooperation of the committee members this matter had been clarified and there are now two vacancies to be filled. Therefore, the SECRETARY placed in nomination names of Professor Rufus Fellers, College of Engineering, and Professor David Phillips, Department of Music. There were no additional nominations from the floor at this time.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Keith Berkeley, Chairman:

The report was approved with editorial corrections.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor John L. Safko, Chairman:

The report was approved as submitted. PROFESSOR SAFKO requested the Senators to convey an apology to departments with respect to an erroneous list of courses which have not been offered in the past few years which was circulated to the departments. PROFESSOR SAFKO explained that his committee had been given an incorrect list. His successor, Professor Peter Sederberg, will continue a review of this matter in the coming academic year.

D. Faculty House Board of Governors, Professor Richard Conant, Chairman:

Proposal
to make
Faculty
House a
Private
Corporation

PROFESSOR CONANT addressed the Senate on a proposal which had been previously circulated to the Senators, the General Faculty, and the Faculty House membership to remove Faculty House from under the direct control and management of the University. He explained that this would be accomplished by incorporation of the Faculty House as a private corporation by entering into a contractual relationship between the University and the Faculty House. PROFESSOR CONANT added that this proposal was approved unanimously by the Faculty House Board of Governors, subject to the approval of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Faculty House membership. He shared with the Senate the Board's conviction the agreement "is in the best interest of the Club and service to the faculty and other members". PROFESSOR CONANT then read to the Senate from the text of a letter previously circulated to the faculty, to which he made a number of editorial additions and comments for the benefit of the Faculty Senators, as follows: (departures from letter's text appear in brackets)

The problem has been that while most state rules and regulations work well for state agencies and the normal operations of the University, they do not work well for what is essentially a first-class, but small-scale, restaurant/club.

This reorganization through incorporation would facilitate numerous operational procedures in the management of the Club, including the hiring of personnel on other than a temporary basis [which, by the way, is the case for all the employees with the exception of the manager Bob Funderburk and his assistant Judy Lewis] (which is all that is currently allowed). It would allow the management more flexibility in purchasing food stuffs, equipment, and other necessary services. [such as renovations, repairs, stoves, things of this nature- In my letter, by the way I alluded to the possible option of procuring outside printing services at times. I want to

set the record straight that this is not aimed at Printing Services. The problem is that we all seem to fall behind the eight ball at times in getting things to them. Frequently there is something that you have to get out to the membership at the last minute and we cannot always be running over there and saying please do this yesterday and give us priority over all the other orders you have sitting there. This is a problem I think with their volume . . . They have been very cooperative with the Faculty House. So I want to make sure that record is set straight since I did receive some flak from that direction.]

The reorganization is not designed to, nor will it, take the Club's operation away from the Faculty. The composition of the Board will remain the same. The Board is presently composed of five faculty members and three administrative appointments made by the President. Various legal and financial questions regarding the incorporation have been satisfactorily addressed and the Board, therefore, strongly recommends adoption of this plan.

[Basically the reason for this recommendation is two pronged (1) concern with the state auditors' situation - there have been complaints in the past about such things as even the Educational Foundation, as I understand it, having a University paid staff, time and a building. So this had to be addressed and a contractual agreement was made there so that it was covered legalistically to avoid any appearance of improper expenditure of University funds. The R and D situation, the research park, the Credit Union are all in a similar situation. I am no lawyer but this is what I understand. We would have had Paul Ward here today but he is studying at Harvard for a month and the President is, of course, in Europe. We asked many questions about many of these factors and we felt they have been satisfactorily addressed. Now we could arrange, for example, for possibly a five year contract with the University where they would cover certain salary factors and certain expenses at a kind of descending rate over a five year span at which time when our profits hopefully are increasing for the Faculty House Club. The University would get a percentage, for example, for faculty dependents' scholarships, possibly an endowment for Faculty House, possibly the Educational Foundation. In the meantime we would be paying rent to the University and a certain amount for heating etc. There would be an official arrangement there. The advantage there again is primarily one of the employment situation. For example, some very fine chefs are now on temporary basis. They have no job security, no benefits, and it is just completely and obviously a difficult way to run that kind of an operation. Bob has great difficulties procuring foodstuffs. It is a very volatile business. This would enable him, for example, to be able to bargain at the Farmers Market for a quick purchase - when there is a bunch of filet mignon on special or parships or whatever. He has had a devil of a time in one instance, for example having to wait for the kitchen to be renovated last fall, when we started with the new management, until December which obviously slowed down the incorporation of the upstairs meal. We still would have the option of utilizing the University services and probably would most of the time but at least we could move elsewhere when time and financial considerations dictated so. Some of the disadvantages financially would be we would have to have directors' insurance, the legal costs of incorporation, and we would have to hire an outside auditor. Some people have said 'well, suppose we have financial problems?' Well, we always have had financial problems and without the support of a benign administration the Faculty House would fold today or it would have folded last year or the year before that. We can hopefully expect that this would be addressed in the future even if the Faculty House were legally a separate corporation and perhaps this can even be put in writing in some kind of manner that would not offend the state auditor. This is essentially a

legalistic move to protect the University and yet facilitate the operation of Faculty House. Members would hopefully see no apparent difference when they go over there except, for example, it would be easier to start a downstairs dining service at reasonable cost, presumably to buy food cheaper, quicker, and we would get the downstairs fixed up so it is appropriately stabilized and fixed for an evening meal. This is our next goal, hopefully, which will also counterbalance the price rise hopefully that we had to adjust to recently. We know there are some complaints about certain aspects of Faculty House now. We don't think that really relates to the question of this particular move although we would be happy later or in a separate meeting with Faculty House membership to address some of these issues. We are not completely satisfied with everything either. It is a complex operation trying to make it come out in the black and yet address the needs of the faculty and staff of the University. By the way, we are hoping to get faculty members' discounts and you can make special arrangements for the non-gourmet dining room if you want to avoid a \$15.50 price tag. We just don't want to advertise that too widely.]

Motion
on
Faculty
House
Presented
and
Adopted

PROFESSOR CONANT at this juncture then made the following motion to the Senate:
that Faculty House be recognized as an independent non-profit corporation in consultation with and subject to the approval of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

The CHAIR pointed out for the information of the Senate that this motion was unanimously endorsed by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee immediately prior to this Senate meeting and in the opinion of the Chair, the motion requires no second. The motion was approved unanimously.

E. Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee, Professor Trevor Howard-Hill, Chairman:

Motion to
Suspend
Rules
Approved
and PEDU
Standards
Approved

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL drew the attention of the Senators to a hand-out distributed at this meeting requesting a change in the standards in the Department of Physical Education. He explained that for these proposed changes to be considered at this meeting, according to the Senate rules, that a two-thirds vote would be necessary to suspend the Senate rules. The motion was duly seconded and the Senate voted unanimously in favor of considering this matter at this meeting. PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL then submitted the circulated requested changes of standards for the Department of Physical Education and these were approved by the Senate.

There were no other reports from Faculty Committees.

IV. Report of Secretary.

No report.

V. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

VI. New Business.

There was no new business presented to the Senate.

VII. Good of the Order.

Suggestions
from
Senator
Moore

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, urged the Faculty House Board of Governors to send in the fall a letter to all faculty and staff both as a recruitment device and also to explain what has happened to Faculty House. PROFESSOR MOORE complimented Professor Conant on his presentation to the Senate. In reference to another matter, Professor Moore suggested that the Administration might consider adopting 7:00 a.m. classes for next

year's summer session. PROFESSOR MOORE also suggested that the University might profit from having a liaison officer between itself and the Governor's Office and suggested such a person on the faculty as Professor John Stucker, who according to Professor Moore, "has worked with the Governor's Office over a number of years both on professional activities and political activities and is a tenured member of the faculty here and might be the kind of person that at least would facilitate some of the relationships between the President's Office and the Governor's Office."

Professor
Safko
Commended

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, noted the fact that Professor Safko is completing his term as Chairman of the Committee on Curriculum and Courses and informed the Senate "that I believe I speak for many Senators when I say that he did an excellent job for the last couple of years". PROFESSOR SABIA also requested that it be brought to the attention of the Administration that there are several problems with having Saturday classes during summer school: "one is that lots of students don't attend and the other is that lots of faculty cancel their classes".

Provost
Solicits
Written
Suggestions
on
Summer
School
Problem

PROVOST BORKOWSKI commented he had received a number of unsolicited very constructive letters on the problem of summer school and this is apparently a growing concern on the part of a number of members of the University community. DR. BORKOWSKI informed the Senate that he would like to provide this fall for an ad hoc committee or an established committee to study a number of suggestions that have been submitted. He urged the Senators to put their suggestions in writing and to forward them to him and expressed his appreciation in advance. He also indicated that such suggestions will receive "a great deal of consideration".

VIII. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

Patent
and
Copyright
Nominations
Now
Contested

At this time the floor was reopened for additional nominations to the Patent and Copyright Committee. PROFESSOR MARY ANDERSON OF THE COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES nominated Professor Ronald Baughman of the College of Applied Professional Sciences. PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, inquired as to whether there were currently any lawyers serving on that committee and the Chair informed the Senate that one of the members, Professor Shipley, is an attorney. The Chair informed the Senate that a mail ballot would be necessary for this contested committee election and declared the nominations closed.

The CHAIR acknowledged "the dedication of his colleagues on this day, at this time, and for this kind of service".

The Senate was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.